R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 456 UD 004 149

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, TITLE I, INDIANA STATE EVALUATION REPORT FISCAL YEAR 1966.

INDIANA STATE DEPT. PUBLIC INSTR., INDIANAPOLIS

PUB DATE 15 DEC 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.92 46P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, SPECIAL SERVICES, TABLES (DATA), PRIVATE SCHOOLS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, STUDENT NEEDS, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, STAFF IMPROVEMENT, EXPENDITURES, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, ANNUAL REPORTS, INNOVATION, STATISTICAL DATA, INDIANA, ESEA TITLE 1

GENERALLY FOLLOWING THE FORMAT STIPULATED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION, THIS REPORT DESCRIBES AND EVALUATES THE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ACTIVITIES WHICH WERE INSTITUTED TO ASSIST INDIANA'S PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. THE TWO MOST PREVALENT TYPES OF TITLE I ACTIVITIES WERE LANGUAGE ARTS AND TEACHER AID PROGRAMS, OTHER ACTIVITIES INCLUDED PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH SERVICES, CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION, VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS, AND PARENT EDUCATION. STATISTICAL INFORMATION, TABULAR DATA, AND A SAMPLE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FORM ARE INCLUDED. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

04149

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INDIANA STATE EVALUATION REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1966

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

ACT OF 1965 - TITLE I

SUBMITTED BY

THE INDIANA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
227 STATE HOUSE
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46024

DECEMBER 15, 1966

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I
1. Operation and Services....3
2. Dissemination....3
3. Evaluation....6
4. Major Problem Areas....7
5. Implementation of Section 205 (a) (1)....8
6. Coordination of Title I and Community Action Programs....8
7. Inter-Relationship of Title I With Other Titles of ESEA....10
8. Cooperative Projects Between Districts....11
9. Non-public School Participation....12
10. Supplementary Materials....14

PART II
1. Statistical Information....16
2. Establishing Project Areas....17
3. Needs....18
4. Local Educational Agency Problems....19
5. Prevalent Activities....21
6. Innovative Projects....22
7. Methods of Increasing Staff for Title I Projects....23
8. Measuring Instruments....25
9. Analysis of Effective Activities and Methods....26
10. General Analysis of Title I....29

PART III

Table I....33
Table II....33
Table III....33
Table IV....34
Table V....34
Table VI....34
Table VII....34
Tabular Data....34

APPENDIX
Indiana LEA Annual Evaluation Report Form....36

INTRODUCTION

The State of Indiana, through the Department of Public Instruction, hereby submits its Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965-Title I- State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1966.

It has been the intent throughout this evaluation to follow the plan of OE form 4320. This has not been possible in some instances. Some of the requested information has not been collected in Indiana. In other instances the information collected did not lend itself to the OE plan.

An attempt has been made to explain the reasons when items either were not completed or were completed in a form different from that suggested. Plans are being formulated for future evaluation which hopefully will provide all the requested information.

PART I

PART I

*1. OPERATION AND SERVICES:

Site visitations were conducted in most cases where the State has been asked to visit or where problems existed. Approximately fifty such visits were conducted during FY 66.

Conferences were conducted with the following groups in order to disseminate information about ESEA:

LEA Superintendents; LEA School Boards; University Consultants; PTA's; Nursing and Medical Associations; Directors of Title I projects; Evaluation personnel; and Superintendents of Nonpublic Schools.

The State Universities assigned specific faculty members as consultants to the State Department of Public Instruction to advise local educational agencies in the development, implementation, and evaluation of Title I projects.

* A state meeting was held with representives of the State Schools for the Handicapped to explain the potential involvement of these agencies in P.L. 89-313.

*2. DISSEMINATION:

a. LEA Dissemination Plans

1. To Other LEA's

In a sampling of thirty-four Indiana counties representing 156 LEA's, the most frequent method (as reported by 48 LEA's) of disseminating information at the local level was to inform patrons in the local area via community newspaper releases, radio broadcasts, and local school newspaper columns. Presentations by speakers at community and service organization meetings and parent and teacher meeting rated second in the sampling with thirty-four LEA's using this means of dissemination. Personal conferences, participation in workshop presentations, and group discussions ranked next in frequency with twenty-three LEA's using these methods.

Ten of the local agencies reported that the period of operation was too short and expressed a need to evaluate their programs before sharing findings with other locals. In-service training sessions for personnel in the local schools, reporting at school board meetings, home visitations, written reports to parents, writing for educational publications, answering questionnaires for doctorial candidates, inclusion of information in church bulletins, and correspondence in answer to specific queries were other methods used for dissemination.

Two local educational agencies reported loaning personnel to other corporations for preparation of proposed programs. Conversation between superintendents and the Title I staff revealed a spirited exchange of information concerning Title I projects had taken place informally whenever superintendents met.

* P.L. 89-313

Eight institutions participated under Public Law 89-313 during Fiscal Year 1965. The Indiana School for the Deaf prepared and had distributed (as a result of requests) copies of the work done in its Modern Mathematics and Reading Workshops. Dittoed exercises and transparancies were included as well as a detailed description of the work accomplished.

School bulletins sent to parents and interested persons, described plans for participation under Public Law 89-313.

Personal conferences to exchange ideas was the most prevalent method of disseminating information by the eight groups.

2. To State Agency

Reporting to the state office was done for the most part on the required forms. Indiana State University prepared a bulletin in April, 1966, of Representative Title I Projects of Indiana State University's Educational Development Council School Corporations. Indiana University's Education Department prepared and distributed a bulletin describing a conference on the Culturally Deprived Child which was held in August, 1966.

Ball State University conducted a United States Office of Education sponsored workshop to prepare personnel to evaluate Title I projects.

Twelve of the reports from the sampling described in Part I, 2, (a-1) were inadequate in that they did not report on the items concerning dissemination of information to the state.

* P.L. 89-313

Reports requested and required were submitted to the State Educationa Agency; 100 per cent participation was received.

b. SEA Dissemination Plans

Dissemination of information by every possible means the staff of Title I could devise was used. Title I staff scheduled meetings with personnel of the Division of Mental Retardation of the State Department of Mental Health as well as with the State Board of Health. A working relationship existed with the Indiana Medical Association and the Indiana Nurses Association and the Title I staff. Personnel in these associations were kept informed of the projects developed in Title I which dealt with thei specific area of interest and concern. Copies of portions of applications of interest to units in the State Department of Instruction were distributed.

Meetings were held with personnel of the Department of Public Welfare to develop lines of communication and to share information of promising educational practices. The State Library was kept informed of Title I activity through a cooperative venture with the Title II staff which acted as liaison between the Division of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the personnel of the State Library.

The State Director of Title I and the Office of Economic Opportunity State Technical Assistance Officer exchanged lists of approved Title I projects and Community Action Programs.

Articles concerning activities of Title I appeared in The Hoosier Schoolmaster, the official publication of the Indiana Department of Public Instruction.

Regional meetings and workshops were conducted to assist local agencies in the dissemination of information and the exchange ideas. (see item #1 Part I.)

Title I staff members served as resource persons to universities and colleges in pre-service and post-service training for Title I projects, to organizations related to teaching to better inform them of Title I, and to lay groups interested in Title I programs. In visitation with LEA's, the Title I staff shared descriptions of promising educational practices garnered from other projects in the state and the nation.

A monthly bulletin was sent to the superintendents in each Indiana LEA to attract interest and to dispence information about Title I programs.

A brochure reporting the proceedings of the kindergarten workshop conducted cooperatively by Lawrence Township, Marion County, and Title I and Title V ESEA was prepared for distribution to 2500 educators in Indiana.

Title I personnel presented information to meetings or conventions of organizations and groups such as PTA, Phi Delta Kappa, Pi Lamba Theta, Indiana Association of Industrial Art Teachers, Indiana School Board Association, Public School Superintendent Association, Superintendents of Catholic Schools, and Inter Group of Policy Makers of Women Leaders.

Handouts were mailed freely upon request. Interviews were granted to newspaper, radio, and television reporters. Clippings concerning Title I were collected. The dissemination of information concerning Title I was the ongoing concern of Title I personnel who realized a contribution could be made to the Federal program, the Indiana Department of Public Instruction, and the youth of Indiana through adequate distribution and dissemination of Title I information.

A suggestion was made by an LEA that mailings concerning Title I be made to persons other than the superintendent, who may overlook sending the information on to others working with Title I. These occurances restricted dissemination to some extent. Attempts will be devised to reduce these problems in FY 67.

* P.L. 89-313

A Consultant for Special Services was appointed to the staff in May, 1966, and devoted much time and engery working with agencies for the handicapped. This person conferred with numerous related agencies and persons regarding programs for the handicapped and presented information by speaking to such organizations.

*3. EVALUATION:

a. SEA Evaluation Assistance to LEA's

General assistance for evaluation has been provided to local education agencies by the total Title I staff and the four State University Title I consultants. A copy of the state LEA Annual Evaluation Report form and the instructions thereto are included in appendix A.

* P.L. 89-313

Same

b. SEA Personnel Providing Evaluation Assistance

Benjamin Rice, Director, Title I; Gerald Holzhauer, Assistant Director, Title I; Corinne Walker, Consultant, Title I; Ed Robbins, Consultant, Title I; and Wayne Owens, Director, Title III.

* P.L. 89-313

Same

c. Consultants Providing Evaluation Assistance to the SEA

James McElhenney, Consultant, Ball State University; Charles Hopkins, Consultant, Indiana State University; K. Forbis Jordan, Consultant, Indiana University; and Eldon Null, Consultant, Purdue University.

* P.L. 89-313

Same

d. Number of Projects Using Various Evaluation Designs

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
19	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
168	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
91	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State, or national groups.
71	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
89	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
6	Combination of above.

*4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS:

a. SEA Administration Problems

A limited staff contributed to the problem of a delay of two to three weeks in the review of proposals.

A manpower shortage over the state contributed to many projects not being implemented, or being implemented on a limited basis only. A lack of knowledge of how to teach the educationally deprived created frustration throughout the state.

The evaluation forms were developed too late for the distribution to local educational agencies to allow adequate planning for and conducting of evaluation. There was concern about the number of reports required. There was strong feeling throughout the state that all reporting could be done at one time. The pre-school survey and the preliminary survey conducted by the U.S. Office could have been included in the final evaluation.

* P.L. 89-313

The State of Indiana was given a tentative allocation for agencies eligible for P.L. 89-313 funds in the amount of $1,074,409.00. The State was informed that applications could be approved for funds up to that amount. The State insisted upon waiting for a final allocation of funds before approving applications. After receiving some rather unpleasant phone calls and letters from interested people and the U.S. Office of Education, the State proceeded to approve applications in the amount of tentative allocations. The final allocation came to Indiana in the amount of $556,945.00. This created a rather unpleasant situation.

The final allocations came during the second week of June. The fact that only eight of the eligible institutions applied for grants suggests that the delay in receiving final allocations may have been a causative factor.

b. Suggested Legislation

Legislation or selective service regulations should be adopted which would make teachers of Title I draft exempt. Legislation to make funds available for the fiscal year should be enacted as early as April 1, in order to assure adequate planning for ongoing programs.

* P.L. 89-313

Eligibility and amount of funding must be determined at an earlier date, and SEA should be given more authority to determine eligible institutions and to allocate funds to those deemed eligible.

*5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 (a) (1) :

a. Types of Projects Not Approvable When First Submitted

The types of projects that were not approvable when first submitted to the State were: (1) those which seemed to be general aid; (2) those requesting only equipment; (3) those requesting equipment not related to the project; and (4) construction projects not related to Title I activity.

* P.L. 89-313

Same

b. Common Misconceptions of LEA Concerning Purposes

The common misconceptions of local educational agencies concerning the purposes of Title I were: (1) that students to be served were to be identified as low income children; (2) that there was only one approach to meeting the needs of the disadvantaged; and (3) that schools are still bound by the four walls.

* P.L. 89-313

Same

*6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS:

a. Number of LEA's with Funded CAA Programs

256 (CAA programs approved prior to September 1, 1966.)

b. Funds Approved for LEA's with Approved CAA Programs

$12,677,317.48 (CAA programs approved prior to September 1, 1966.)

c. SEA Plans to Insure Cooperation Between Title I and CAA Programs

The State Director of Title I and the Office of Economic Opportunity, State Technical Assistance Officer, Roger L. Hunt, 1019 State Office Building, Indianapolis, Indiana, exchanged lists of approved Title I projects and Community Action programs. These officers met periodically to discuss the ongoing programs in various communities.

The State Title I office included the State Technical Officer in its mailing.

d. Successes in Securing LEA-CAA Cooperation

A sample of eighty-seven LEA's showed that thirty-two had no funded CAA project for their school districts. Thirty-four LEA's were in areas where the funding for the CAA programs had been made after their Title I programs were planned and in operation. In these cases, even though there had been no initial cooperative planning, several schools indicated that good working relations had been established. Seventeen LEA's were in areas where CAA programs had been funded prior to the planning of their Title I programs. All seventeen reported either good or excellent cooperation with the CAA programs. In six of these cases it was reported that one reason for good relations was the inclusion of a school staff member on the CAA Executive Committee.

e. Problems in Securing LEA-CAA Cooperation

No LEA in the sample indicated a specific problem in securing CAA cooperation. The schools did indicate, however, that in some cases where CAA's where servicing large geographical areas, some of the outlying school districts were not informed of the CAA programs. In a few cases they were not aware the CAA program had been funded.

f. Inter-relationships of Title I and CAA Programs

The most common cooperation between the two groups involved the Head Start programs. The general arrangement was for LEA's to provide physical facilities for Head Start programs. Usually teachers from LEA's were employed to teach in Head Start programs.

The second area of close cooperation was with the CAA Neighborhood Youth Corps. Much on the job training of these youths was conducted in the schools. Home visitors, lunch room and kitchen workers, custodial aides, and special student aides to teachers were some of the jobs mentioned. Other areas of cooperation included providing transportation and guidance and counseling programs.

* P.L. 89-313

Because of the nature of the institutions participating in these programs and the late date of project approval, all eight institutions reported tha no efforts were made to coordinate activities.

g. Suggestion for Legislation

The successes reported between LEA's and CAA's seem to indicate that present legislation is adequate.

* P.L. 89-313

Legislation might be provided which would allow CAA programs to include special institutions in their programs.

#7. INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

a. Title II

Impressions from visitations, newspaper accounts, and evaluation reports show cooperation with Title II ESEA to be the most prevalent. In several instances materials were obtained for a library or materials center under Title II, but personnel, equipment, shelving, remodeling, and other items were obtained with Title I funds. Projects in the Yorktown, Columbus, Lake Ridge, Rushville, Munster, and Marion school corporations are examples of this kind of cooperation.

Often the same persons directed or supervised both Title I and Title II programs in the LEA. Cooperation between Title I and Title II was indicated in forty-five cases of a sampling of 156 corporations in thirty-four of Indiana's ninety-two counties.

b. Title III

Cooperative planning was encouraged by the Director of Title III as he urged each LEA to evaluate all funds available at the local level to augment or supplement the proposed Title III project and to provide a comprehensive program approach.

Thirty-one Title III projects were approved in Indiana during Fiscal Year 1966, and the following were found to include cooperative planning and utilization of Title I funds: North Warren, Terre Haute, Valparaiso, Elwood, Bicknell, Hammond, Monticello, and Marion.

c. Title IV

The Title IV program did not become operational until Fiscal Year 1967.

d. Title V

A workshop for kindergarten teachers in the state was conducted cooperatively by staff members from Title V and Title I. The workshop, June 28 to July 1, was sponsored by the M.S.D. of Lawrence Township of Marion County and operated under Title I funds. The workshop was well attended and favorable comments are still being received.

e. Successes in Relating Title I With Other Titles of ESEA

The successes seem to have far outnumbered the problems involved in developing and implementing projects. The successes have been described above in items (a) through (d).

f. Problems in Relating Title I With Other Titles of ESEA

In Indiana a willingness has been evident for cooperation among titles of ESEA. Cooperation seems to have been hampered, however, by the lack of time for getting things done and the small SEA staff. Only the Title I Director was employed before March, 1966. At that time, the

Assistant Director was employed. A Consultant for Special Services joined the staff in May, 1966, and a Reading Consultant in June, 1966. Increased services are possible now.

g. Suggestions for Legislation

Present legislation seem to provide for cooperation adequately.

* P.L. 89-313

Interest has been expressed by the agencies for the handicapped to participate in programs under other Titles, but as of this date none has been approved.

*8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS:

a. Successes in Developing Cooperative Projects Between Districts

In four Indiana counties the unreorganized school townships of each county joined together in cooperative projects under the administration of the county superintendent. These cooperative projects, involving from four to ten townships, involved an allocation and number of pupils sizeable enough to employ specilized persons to meet the needs of the disadvantaged children of the districts.

In one Indiana county all the districts joined together for a cooperative project. Some of the districts were school townships and some were reorganized districts, but all were relatively small in enrollment. Jointly they were able to implement a health and recreational program which individually they could not have done.

In one other Indiana county a reorganized district and three school townships which were awaiting a vote on reorganization joined for a project. The success of their efforts not only proved of benefit to the educational programs instituted for the disadvantaged but may also have been an important factor in the successful vote for their reorganization into one district.

In eleven other instances joint projects were established because of legal transfers of children from one district to another. In several of these instances a district did not operate schools and in the others they operated only elementary schools and transferred the high school pupils. Consequently joint projects were developed so that the funds might be utilized where the children attended school.

* P.L. 89-313

There were no joint projects proposed by the institutions eligible under P.L. 89-313.

b. Problems in Developing Cooperative Projects Between Districts

There were two problem areas in joint project development in Indiana. First, legislation of the state restricted certain joint efforts between

townships in different counties. Secondly, the need to have a joint project because of the transfer of students added a slight burden to the districts in the preparation of the project application.

Problems involved in implementing cooperative projects were the same as those for implementing other projects - the shortage of personnel. For example, the joint project involving an entire county proposed a mobile guidance facility. The mobile unit was purchased, but all efforts to obtain the person needed to conduct the program was unsuccessful. Some persons interviewed for the position indicated an unwillingness to accept the position because they would be employees of the intermediate unit established for the joint project and their continued employment would be dependent upon the Congress continuing Title I, the districts continuing to work jointly, and the SEA approving subsequent applications for a continuation of the project.

* P.L. 89-313

Bureaucracy at the state level made efforts in this direction very difficult.

c. Suggestions for Legislation

No suggestions are offered. The amendment to P.L. 89-10 has permitted the SEA to allocate funds from the districts transferring children to the districts receiving them. Hence the problem of joint projects to serve transferring children has been eliminated. It is hoped that state legislation may be enacted enabling school townships in different counties to conduct joint projects.

*9. NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:

a. SEA Plans to Encourage LEA-Nonpublic School Contacts

The steps taken to develop initiative by local administrators in contacting nonpublic school officials were to encourage these administrators, from the very beginning of the planning of Title I, to communicate and and work with the commissioned nonpublic schools within the LEA's boundaries if a significant number of children enrolled in the nonpublic schools resides in the target area. These steps were reemphasized through meetings, private conversations, bulletins, and letters to LEA's.

b. Successes in Developing Public and Nonpublic School Cooperation

The success which was experienced in developing and implementing public and nonpublic cooperative projects was that many Title I projects were developed which included special services being conducted on the premises of the nonpublic school or programs being made available to nonpublic school children at the public school.

c. Problems in Developing Public and Nonpublic School Cooperation

Problems experienced in developing and implementing public and nonpublic school cooperative projects were: (1) the nonpublic school demanding

services in a greater proportion than their children should receive; (2) the nonpublic school not wanting to identify the residences of their children, i.e. whether children live in the target area; (3) irresponsible newspaper reporters giving misinformation to the public - this included general circulation newspapers and special parochial newspapers; and (4) the superintendent of the nonpublic school communicating with agencies or persons other than the SEA and securing information not appropriate for Indiana.

d. Suggestion for Legislation

A recommendation for revising the legislation concerning public and nonpublic participation is to make it mandatory for the nonpublic school to furnish the public school officals with the names, places of residence, and special educational needs of the children of the nonpublic school.

* P.L. 89-313

No nonpublic schools were eligible for participation in P.L. 89-313.

e. Number of Projects and Nonpublic School Children Participating By Type of Arrangement[1]

	On Public School Grounds Only		On Nonpublic School Grounds Only		On Other than Public or Nonpublic School Grounds	
	Proj.	Children	Proj.	Children	Proj.	Children
Regular School Day	60	7273	52	7092	9	396
Before School Day	1	3	4	220	2	66
After School	23	824	16	214	2	8
Weekend	20	761	11	134		
Summer	116	3185	8	200	4	589
Reg. Sch. Day & Before School						
Reg. Sch. Day & After School						
Reg. Sch. Day & Weekend						
Reg. Sch. Day & Summer						
Before & After School	1	3	5	305		
After School & Weekend						
After School, Weekend & Summer						
After School & Summer						
Reg. Sch. Day, Before Sch. & After School						
Reg. Sch. Day, Before School, After School, Weekend & Summer						
Combination	5	44			1	7
TOTAL	226	12093	96	8165	18	1066

[1]Data not collected for participation on both public and nonpublic school grounds.

*10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS:

a. SEA Guidelines and/or Publications

The state agency was too busy with administrative detail to have guidelines or other publications printed.

b. Evaluation Contracts

Neither the state agency nor LEA's contracted for evaluation.

c. Compilation of Objective Measurements

The results of objective measurements of attainments for Title I programs submitted to the SEA by LEA's were not reported in enough detail to allow compilation. Efforts are being made to develop a format for future evaluation which will provide the required information.

* P.L. 89-313

Same

PART II

PART II COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

The results included in Part II are based on the following sampling techniques:

SMSA Classification A: All nine Indiana LEA's in SMSA Classification A were used in the sample.

SMSA Classification B: All seven Indiana LEA's in SMSA Classification B were used in the sample.

SMSA Classification C: Of the 115 Indiana LEA's in SMSA Classification C, twenty-two were included in the sample.

SMSA Classification D: Of the 187 Indiana LEA's in SMSA Classification D, Thirty-eight were included in the sample.

SMSA Classification E: Of the seventy Indiana LEA's in SMSA Classification E, eleven were included in the sample.

Public Law 89-313: All eight Indiana State agencies directly responsible for schools for handicapped children were used in the sample.

In the three classifications where sampling was used, the plan was to select every fifth LEA from an alphabetical list of LEA's by county. In the case of joint projects where this method would have resulted in the selection of two LEA's participating in the same joint project, the plan was to include in the sample only the first LEA selected in such a joint project.

*1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION:

SMSA Classification	Number of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of Children				Average per pupil Col. 3 by Col. 4
			Total Col. 5, 6 & 7	Public	Non-public	Not Enrolled	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	9	6,014,297.87	59910	47734	12176	Included in Col.5	100.39
B	7	666,573.79	3931	3800	131	"	169.57
C	115	2,242,874.23	15800	14540	1260		141.95
D	187	7,742,108.53	49081	46423	2658		157.74
E	70	656,762.34	3415	3407	8		192.31
TOTAL	338	17,322,616.76	132137	115904	16233		131.10
* P.L. 89-313	8	221,623.43	406	296	110		545.87

*2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS:

Source	No. of LEA's using source by rank order of use				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
SMSA Class: A					
Census Data	6			1	
School Survey	1	2	2	4	
AFDC Data		3	2		
Teacher Opinion	1	1			
Achievement Test Results	1		1		
SMSA Class: B					
Census Data	3				
Welfare - County & Township	2		1		
Teacher Opinion		1	1		
Principal Opinion		1	1		
Housing Conditions		1		1	
SMSA Class: C					
School Survey	5	2	3	1	
Welfare - County & Township	4	4	4		
Census Data	6			2	1
Health Statistics		5	3		
Single Attendance Area	3				
SMSA Class: D					
Welfare - County & Township	4	9	5	2	1
School Survey	8	4	3		
Census Data	10		1	1	1
Achievement Test Results	2	5			1
Teacher Opinion	3	2	2		
SMSA Class: E					
Single Attendance Area	6				
School Survey	2				
Welfare - County & Township		2			
Teacher Opinion		1	1		
Health Statistics			1	1	

*3. NEEDS

Pupil Needs	No. of LEA's indicating needs by rank of need				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
SMSA Class: A					
Poor Reading Ability	5	1			1
Poor Health		4	2	2	
Negative Self Image	3				
Inadequate Arithmetic Skills	1	2			1
Inadequate Cultural Experience		2	2		
SMSA Class: B					
Poor Reading Ability	6	1			
Negative Self Image		3	1		
Poor Health		1		3	
Inadequate Clothing			2		
Negative Attitude toward School	1				
SMSA Class: C					
Poor Reading Ability	16	2	2		
Poor Health		5	4		
Negative Self Image	1	4	1	3	
Inadequate Nutrition	1	2	2		
Inadequate Arithmetic Skills	1	2			
SMSA Class: D					
Poor Reading Ability	29	2		1	
Negative Self Image	4	9	3	1	
Poor Health	1	7	7	2	1
Inadequate Arithmetic Ability		6	2		
Speech Defect	1	3	1	1	
SMSA Class: E					
Inadequate Reading Ability	10				
Inadequate Arithmetic Ability		4			
Poor Health		2	1	1	
Negative Self Image		2	1		1
*** P.L. 89-313**					
Poor Reading Ability	3				
Mental Retardation	2				
Inadequate Academic Ability	1	1			
Speech Defect	1				
Hearing Defect		1			

*4. LEA PROBLEMS

Problem	No. of LEA's indicating problems by rank order of problems 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
SMSA Class: A					
Lack of Personnel	8		1		
No. of LEA's indicating by type					
2 Regular Classroom					
1 Administrators					
1 Speech Therapists					
4 Psychologists					
4 Counselors					
4 Social Workers					
1 Reading Specialists					
1 Nurse					
2 Librarian and/or A.V. Specialist					
1 Non-professional					
Delay in receiving materials		1	1	1	
Late starting date	1				
Controversy over Aide to Children in nonpublic Schools		1			
No Others Listed					
SMSA Class: B					
Lack of Personnel	3				
No. of LEA's indicating by type					
2 Reading Specialists					
1 Administrator					
1 Non-professional					
Delay in receiving materials	2	1			
No other problems indicated					
SMSA Class: C					
Lack of Personnel	11	2			
No. of LEA's indicating need by type of personnel					
5 Reading Specialists					
3 Regular Classroom Teachers					
2 Non-professional					
1 Administration					
1 Special Education					
Lack of School Facilities	4	2			
Delay in receiving Supplies and Equipment	3	3			
Identifying Participants from nonpublic schools	1				
Planning project to meet needs		1			

Problem	No. of LEA's indicating problems by rank order of problem 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
SMSA Class: D					
Lack of Personnel	11	2			
No. of LEA's indicating need by type of personnel					
13 Reading Specialists					
7 Classroom Teachers					
6 Counselors					
4 Speech Therapists					
3 Psychologists					
3 Special Math					
3 Librarian and/or A.V. Specialists					
2 Administrators					
1 Non-professional					
1 Nurse					
1 Social Worker					
Lack of School Facilities	4	5	1		
Late Starting Date	5				
Delay in Receiving Materials		4	1		
Training of Staff		2	1		
SMSA Class: E					
Delay in Receiving Materials	3	2	1		
Lack of Personnel	5				
No. of LEA's indicating need by type of personnel					
3 Reading Specialists					
2 Classroom Teachers					
1 Administrator					
1 Counselor					
Late Starting Date	1		2	1	
Lack of School Facilities		3			
Evaluation Instrument			1		
P.L. 89-313					
Late Approval of Projects	5		1		
Delay in Receiving Materials	1	1	1		
Lack of Personnel	1	2			
No. of LEA's indicating need by type of personnel					
1 Physical Therapist					
1 Occupational Therapist					
1 Vocational Teacher					
1 A.V. Specialist					
Lack of School Facilities		1			

*5. MOST PREVALENT PROJECTS

	Activity	No. of LEA's Indicating
SMSA Class: A		
	Reading	5
	General Elementary Education	4
	Art	3
	Music	3
	Industrial Arts	3
SMSA Class: B		
	Reading	6
	Mathematics	1
	Industrial & Trade Education	1
	Secondary Education	1
	Education of Handicapped	1
SMSA Class: C		
	Reading	21
	Health	3
	Mathematics	2
	Industrial Arts	1
	Education of Handicapped	1
	Guidance	1
SMSA Class: D		
	Reading	32
	General Elementary Education	8
	Mathematics	6
	Health Program	5
	Guidance Program	5
SMSA Class: E		
	Reading	9
	General Elementary Education	2
	Kindergarten	1
	Guidance	1
	Only Major Activities Listed	
P.L. 89-313		
	Education of the Handicapped	8

*6 INNOVATIVE PROJECTS:

SMSA Class A 66-191 East Chicago Schools Special classes were established in five target area elementary schools after school one hour daily and in the summer for non-English speaking pupils grades one through twelve to improve communication skills.

66-198 School City of Hammond A program was established for youngsters from low income families living in communities of low income. Included in the summer activities were trips to concerts, circuses, and other "fun" things. Visits were made to State Parks for summer camping. A portable swimming pool was purchased with Title I funds. Every several weeks the pool was transported to another school in the target area. All disadvantaged children were given an opportunity to learn to swim.

SMSA Class B 66-146 New Albany-Floyd County Consolidated School Corporation Teachers were released from non instruction duties by teacher aides. Individualized study centers were established to give the teacher closer contact with students having difficulties in certain areas. The guidance staff working closely with the teachers would refer students to these centers.

SMSA Class C 66-156 Shelbyville Central Schools A "wholesale approach" to the utilization of specialists such as psychologists, social workers, therapists, and nurses -- who are not normally available in quantity -- was used to give inservice training to regular teachers concerning how to cope with problems of the disadvantaged. Rather than to use the specialist to work with individual students, the specialist "wholesaled" their services to the other teacher, who in turn, served the disadvantaged children.

66-444 M.S.D. of Lawrence Township, Marion County This corporation cooperated with the staff of the State P.L. 89-10 office and the State Department of Public Instruction Curriculum Division in establishing a pilot program in kindergarten for the educationally deprived children. On a space and time available concept, kindergarten teachers from over the entire state working in Title I kindergarten programs were invited to attend the inservice training program which preceded the kindergarten activity. Techniques of teaching the educationally deprived pre-school child were explored. In FY 67 the school district funded the kindergarten program from local funds, and the teachers are utilizing many techniques found to be effective as an outgrowth of the inservice training and practical experience.

66-248 M.S.D. of Martinsville An extensive one week inservice training for a select group of teachers was conducted in the summer to prepare the teachers to work with the educationally deprived children in the next year's program.

SMSA Class D 66-31 Decatur County Community Schools A bookmobile was purchased to serve the county schools. In addition, on a time available concept, the unit was used to circulate books to other federally financed programs, such as a youth work study program and Head Start.

SMSA Class E 66-167 Monroe County Schools The township schools of Monroe County joined in a cooperative project to provide the services of reading specialists to all the participating schools.

66-274 Crawford County Schools The schools of Crawford County joined in a cooperative project and instituted a summer recreational program, a health program with a nurse serving all the target schools, and installed television in many of the classrooms to enrich the program for the disadvantaged.

* P.L. 89-313 See item #9 Part II.

Human interest - An elementary school principal called the State Title I Office and informed that office that a fifth grade pupil had checked out a book which had been purchased with Title I funds. The pupil refused to return the book to the school. The principal asked, "What shall I do?" Further inquiry revealed that the pupil was teaching his father how to read the book.

*7. SEA METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS:

SMSA Class A: Eight of the nine LEA's in this classification indicated that organized inservice programs were conducted to increase the staff's awareness and competency to work with the disadvantaged students in the Title I programs. The persons to work with the Title I program were secured through several sources. Four LEA's indicated that the staff was primarily secured from within the regular school staff. These persons were made available to work with Title I by (a) extending their school day, (b) extending their school week, (c) conducting programs in summer when the persons were not regularly employed at the school, and (d) by replacing them with new persons hired into the system. Five of the LEA's indicated that most of the Title I staff included personnel newly hired into the school system. In all instances where new personnel were hired, either for the Title I program or to replace teachers put into the Title I program, they were hired through regular channels and by the usual techniques.

SMSA Class B: Only two of the seven LEA's in this classification mentioned efforts to develop the competency of their Title I staff by conducting in-service programs. The LEA's in this group put more emphasis in their reports than did any other group on the fact that they used teacher aides to free teachers for more time to carry on the special programs with the disadvantaged students. Four of the seven LEA's indicated that where efforts to obtain teachers and other personnel from outside the system were made they used regular employment securing means. In their reports they indicated no special efforts to get the people they needed. Two of the LEA's indicated that their Title I programs were carried on by members of their regular staff.

SMSA Class C: Seven of the twenty-two LEA's in this classification indicated that their Title I staff was largely made up of persons recruited from within the LEA. They gave no information as to how these persons were freed for the new responsibility or how their replacements were secured. Four of the LEA's reported that they secured Title I staff from outside the LEA and that they used regular hiring methods in their attempts. One LEA made reference to the use it made of certified persons within the community who were willing to work on a part-time basis in the Title I program, and one LEA indicated the use of retired teachers in the Title I programs. Four of the LEA's elaborated rather extensively on their efforts to develop understanding within their staff for the disadvantaged by conducting workshops, by encouraging staff to take courses on the education of the disadvantaged, and by arranging visits to other schools with exemplary programs. Several of the

LEA's offered no specific information regarding their efforts but indicated they had been able to secure some persons for their Title I programs.

SMSA Class D: Fifteen of the thirty-eight LEA's in this sample indicated their staff for Title I was secured from within the LEA and fifteen indicated they used regular hiring techniques to recruit additional personnel. This group made more frequent reference to the use of part-time certified persons for their Title I program recruited from outside the regular staff. Several indicated that some of their regular substitute teachers were being used for this purpose. Only one LEA indicated the use of retired teachers for the Title I program. No LEA's in SMSA class C had made mention of summer school programs, six of the LEA's in class D indicated that summer school was an important means whereby they were able to get the personnel needed to meet the instructional needs of the disadvantaged. Five of the LEA's indicated their Title I staff was primarily non-certified personnel and that they had not experienced difficulty in hiring these persons. Eleven LEA's commented on inservice programs as a means used to increase the ability of their Title I staff to work with the disadvantaged.

SMSA Class E: Five of the eleven LEA's in this category stated their Title I staff was comprised of non-certified personnel who were easily obtained from within the community by regular hiring means. Five of the LEA's indicated they had employed no additional personnel - one of them indicating unsuccessful efforts to obtain a person. Generally the allocation available to these LEA's was too small to allow for hiring additional personnel. Only one LEA referred to an inservice program for the development of Title I staff. Two of the LEA's made mention of the use of regular staff in summer activities.

* P.L. 89-313: Four of the seven institutions reported information concerning their means of securing staff. Three indicated that regular employment methods were used to secure the personnel required for their special Title I summer programs, and one stated that regular personnel were used for the Title I program since they had never had a summer program before. One institution reported significant efforts made through an inservice program to develop the competency of their Title I personnel.

*8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS:

Most Prevalent Used Tests in Title I Projects According to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas listed by School Level.[1]

	P K	1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 -
Metropolitan Readiness	D1,E1	E1			
Iowa Test of Basic Skills		A2,D1	A1,C1,D1,E2	C1,D1,E2	D2
Stanford Achievement		C1,D1,D1	A2,B2,C1,E1	A1,C1,D1,E1	E2
California Achievement		A2,B2,C1,E2	D2,E2	A2,B1,D1,E2	
Durrell-Sullivan Reading		C2,D2	B2,C1,D1	B1,C1,D1	
SRA Achievement		A2	A1,C1,D1	D1	C2
Gates Basic Reading		B1,C1,D1,E1	B1,C1,E1	B1,C1,D1	C1
Gates Reading Tests		A2,B2,C1,D1	A2,B1,C1	C1	
Gray Oral Reading Tests		B2,C2,E1	C2,E2	C2	C2
Iowa Silent Reading Test		D2	D2	A2	D2
Nelson Reading Test		D2	C2,D2	C2,D2	D2
California Test of Mental Maturity		D2	A1,B2,C1,D1	A2,C1,D1	C1
Henman Nelson Test of Mental Maturity			C2	D2	
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence	A1	A1,D1,E2	A2,C2,D1,E2	C2,D1,E2	D1,E2
Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test		C2,D1	A2,D1	A1,C2,D2	D2
SRA Primary Mental Abilities		A2,D1			
SRA Test of General Abilities				A1,C1	
Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale	A1	A2,C2,D2	A2,C2		
Wechsler Intelligence Scale			A2,C2	A2	A2
Lee Clark Reading Readiness	A1				
Metropolitan Achievement		A1,C1,D1	A2,C1,D1,E2	A2,C1,D1,E2	D2
Iowa Test of Educational Development				C2,D1	A1
Peabody Vocabulary		B2			
McGrall Hill Reading Achievement		B2	B2	B1	
Ginn Reading Achievement		B2,D1	B2,D1		
California Readiness		D2	B2,C1	D2	
Scott Foresman Achievement		D2	B2,D2	B1,D1	
NMSQT					C1,D1
SAT					C1,E2
PSAT					C1,D1

[1] A, B, C, D, and E represents the SMSA Classifications. Subpart 1 indicates the test was used very prevalently whereas subpart 2 indicates less prevalently used tests.

*9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS:

a. Most Effective Projects By School Level

Early Years	Middle Years	Teen Years
SMSA Class A		
Language Arts	Language Arts	Language Arts
Health Services	Health Services	Vocational Programs
Teacher Aides	Psychological Services	Parent Education
Cultural Enrichment	Home Visitations	Psychological Service
Individualized Instruction	Individualized Instruction	Home Visitations
SMSA Class B		
Language Arts	Language Arts	Guidance
Health	Recreation	Library
Recreation	Health	Vocational
Teacher Aide	Individual Instruction	Psychological Service
Cultural Enrichment	Home Visitations	Study Centers
SMSA Class C		
Language Arts	Language Arts	Psychologist
Recreation	Speech & Hearing	Language Arts
Individual Instruction	Health Services	Guidance
Cultural Enrichment	Individual Instruction	Individual Instructio
Speech & Hearing	Teacher Aide	Teacher Aide
SMSA Class D		
Language Arts	Guidance	Language Arts
Teacher Aide	Language Arts	Individual Instructio
Health	Teacher Aide	Library
Speech & Hearing	Health	Guidance
Individual Instruction	Cultural Enrichment	Health
SMSA Class E		
Language Arts	Lnaguage Arts	Mathematics
Teacher Aide	Teacher Aide	Language Arts
Health	Mathematics	Recreation
	Health	
* P.L. 89-313		
Outdoor Special Education		
Individualized Instruction		
Inservice Training		
Preparation of Materials		

b. Strengths and Weaknesses of Critical Procedural Aspects

The strengths and weaknesses of each type activity seem to be common among all the SMSA classifications.

Language Arts Language Arts was the most prevalent activity and received the greatest amount of attention as compared to other programs. Some

projects attacked the communication skills problem with remedial programs while others felt a more basic education utilizing innovative approaches as being a more suitable approach. Three basic weaknesses were recognized by personnel working in this area. There was a shortage of trained and/or qualified personnel. Many educators recognized the problems of children in this area but could not diagnose the causative factors. Materials for this kind of program were short in supply. As educators recognized these weaknesses they conducted workshops and inservice training programs to learn new methods and gain new insights. Colleges and Universities assisted LEA's in preparation of personnel. Materials were improvised to meet the problem of limited supplies.

Health Services Better communication between educators and medical professions resulted from Title I activity in the state. The state organizations conducted meetings and conferences concerning health programs in schools. These agencies encouraged local personnel to communicate in the planning and implementing of programs. Local educators and the medical professionals communicated more as a result. There was a lack of qualified personnel, however, the available nursing professionals were utilized more efficiently in health education programs than before. Educators indicate that the nurses were utilized in coordination of health and curricular activities. Health needs of the disadvantaged were met to a greater extent than previously.

Teacher Aides Teacher Aides programs were second most prevalent programs in the state. It was generally accepted that the aides had an impact on education, however, there was no valid evaluative instrument to indicate the direct impact of aides upon the disadvantaged child. One problem recognized in Indiana was that of the identification of duties to insure aides not infringing upon teacher certification regulations. Variations in salary schedules for aides created some problems. Local committees were appointed to develop job descriptions for aides. This was probably the major problem concerning teacher aides. Universities established courses for teacher aides and administrators of teacher aides. Teacher aides were recruited from among persons with a wide variation of training and experience; some with a high school education but no special training or experience and some ex-teachers.

Cultural Enrichment The "four walled school" concept is being broken at a faster rate through the utilization of Title I funds. Field trips, resource people, concerts, movies, and eating in nice restaurants were some of the experiences children from project areas experienced. Many schools traveled great distances for these programs, therefore, the travel expense of these programs discourage some LEA's from participating in these programs. Some educators questioned the advisability of these programs in relation to cost of other programs.

Individualized Instruction Many educators felt that individual instruction projects motivated the disadvantaged to work harder because there was someone who cared and had an interest in the child. There were educators who thought this a luxury difficult to defend in terms of time and money spent for an individual child. One weakness to this program was too many educators unable to work with children on a one to one basis.

Recreation Recreational programs were utilized basically as a motivational technique to encourage students to achieve in other areas. Participants of these programs had many new experiences. Camping opened the door for many of the disadvantaged. One problem experienced in these programs was that personnel were not available to work with the disadvantaged. Personnel trained in this area were already employed in other recreational programs.

Speech and Hearing Speech and hearing specialists were difficult to find. Adequate space conducive for this special program was not available in many schools. Equipment for these specialists was slow in delivery. The programs where personnel, space, and equipment were available were fruitful.

Psychological Service In schools where psychological services were available to assist the teachers and administration in the identification of needs of children, the disadvantaged were identified at an early date. Schools with psychological services available were able to move more rapidly in establishing programs for the disadvantaged. Psychologists occasionally conducted inservice training programs for the general classroom teachers to aid teachers in meeting the needs of the disadvantaged. Teachers were able to recognize symptoms of needs as a result of working with the psychologists. The major weakness of this type program was the short supply of qualified personnel.

Guidance A short supply of trained guidance personnel blocked many programs from being implemented. Active guidance programs reduced the dropout rate. The most effective programs of this nature were those operating new summer guidance programs.

Mathematics Most of the successful programs in mathematics utilized the "modern math" approach. Most of the math programs were conducted concurrently with reading and recreation programs. Summer reading, math, and recreation programs complemented each other. Personnel were difficult to locate in many cases. Inservice training programs were developed to assist teachers in the discovery of methods of teaching the disadvantaged.

Vocational Programs The disadvantaged learned marketable skills as a result of Title I vocational programs. One expressed problem in implementing these programs was the late approval of these projects and consequently venders were not able to deliver equipment and materials early enough to make a great impact upon the disadvantaged. Where equipment, personnel, and supplies were available at an early date, successful programs were launched. Many disadvantaged students are now holding part-time jobs utilizing the skills developed in these programs.

Parent Education Parents involved in educational programs were instrumental in encouraging students to succeed. One child in a fifth grade remedial reading class taught his father to read. The involvement of parents in Title I programs encouraged parents to help their children in their studies. One problem in these programs was a communications break down between the school and the parent. This barrier was difficult to overcome. Schools attacked this problem through parent education and home visitation projects.

Library Services Disadvantaged children were introduced through library services to more materials which were of interest to them. It was found that the disadvantaged child was attracted to books and references if led to interesting and challenging materials. Teachers utilized library materials more when library services were available for planning and conducting programs. Problems in this area were lack of space and the shortage of qualified personnel.

Study Centers Study centers reduced the number of failures in schools; in one school by two thirds. One problem of implementing this program was finding teachers who had time to spend in these centers to perform the services.

Home Visitations Most LEA's implementing home visitation programs indicated this as a valuable part of their project. Home visitation programs received the backing of parents, who, in turn, encouraged children to achieve better in school. There was an expressed need for more training of the home visitors so they could provide more useful services. These visitors expressed desires for better methods of communication.

* P.L. 89-313 The projects for P.L. 89-313 schools were approved at such a late date that programs were too short to permit significant returns. Federal and state bureaucracy hampered the implementation of programs. Two programs did show some success.

A State hospital conducted an outdoor special education program which they felt gave promising results.

One state school for the handicapped conducted a workshop during the summer where the teachers, with the assistance of children, developed materials for fall classes. The teachers felt that the materials developed with the assistance of the children would be more meaningful to the children.

*10. CENTRAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

SMSA Class A LEA's in this classification through Title I provided [illegible] opportunities to the disadvantaged in their target areas. They experienced more ease than other SMSA classes in identifying the target areas. But this created some problems since their target areas had such high concentrations of disadvantaged that they served considerably higher numbers of children than their allocation was based on. Their cost per pupil was consequently lower than that for the other SMSA classes. An extremely large percentage of these children required a substantial amount of social and welfare type of services in oredr to set the stage for learning. In addition they conducted a comprehensive cultural enrichment program to further eqalize learning opportunities for the disadvantaged. Because of the size of their allocations they were able to conduct some pilot programs. It is too early to draw any positive assumptions from these studies but it appears that many of them will result in significant improvement of achievement and attitude changes on the part of the participants. Many of the programs were innovative in terms of meeting the needs of the disadvantaged, whereas, in some of the other SMSA classes the programs were not innovative but were the type of things that many school systems have ordinarily done.

SMSA Class B LEA's in this classification in Indiana used Title I funds mostly to overcome inadequacies in basic subject skills for the disadvantaged. These LEA's provided fewer health and welfare type of services than did most of the other SMSA classes. Although these LEA's had a fairly high percentage of disadvantaged children, the children were less concentracted, and it was more difficult to establish target areas. There were almost no nonpublic schools to be served in the area of these LEA's and so their programs were not hampered by the problem of determining how to legally share programs with nonpublic children. Many opportunities and experiences fairly closely related to increasing subject matter competence were provided to the disadvantaged with a reasonable amount of success. Although the information provided to the State Educational Agency did not allow for any comparison between classes in terms of achievement in specific skills, the general impression from the evaluation reports was that much was accomplished. If personnel had been more available and if materials had been received earlier much more could have been accomplished. This fact applied to all SMSA classes.

SMSA Class C & D The SEA's analysis of local evaluations did not produce observable differences in the effectiveness of programs between these two classifications. Many of the LEA's in these classes instituted summer programs under Title I. In many instances this was the first program held in the LEA in summer or else previous summer programs were primarily attended by the non-disadvantaged. The opportunity to provide transporation and food and health services, which local budgets would not allow, enabled the disadvantaged to attend. If these had not been available many of the disadvantaged would not have attended. It is our impression that the children who participated in these programs gained considerably. These gains affected the whole child - educationally, physically, emotionally, and socially. There were some noteworthy efforts by these small LEA's to expand the school beyond the four walls of the classroom. Although they did not have the resources as readily available as did those in SMSA class A, these LEA's made commendable efforts to do the job they proposed. Some of their programs which considerably helped their disadvantaged may be considered as normal activities in some LEA's, but for most of these LEA's the activities were innovative. These LEA's placed their emphasis on improving basic subject skills such as reading and the reaction from them was that many children not only were learning to read but also wanting to learn.

SMSA Class E The small LEA's in this classification usually involved only one attendance area and so the whole district was the target area. The school people fairly well knew the economic problems of the children in their district, but often knew less well the educational potential of the children. As a result of Title I they made considerable efforts to determine educational needs by testing procedures beyond their usual efforts. These LEA's put considerable efforts in improving reading. This was usually done by the regular teachers who were freed by the employment of teacher aides. These LEA's used a large portion of Title I funds to provide equipment and materials of which the schools usually had little or none. These programs were probably the least directed to the disadvantaged and had a considerable spill-over to most of the students in the schools. Although evaluative procedures were generally weak, it seems that the future of the disadvantaged

in these LEA's was brightened by their Title I programs. The same might be said for most children in these schools. Most of these LEA's could profit by joining in cooperative projects so that more specialized personnel and services could be provided to the disadvantaged students.

PART III

Table 1 The Number of Projects That Employed Each of the Specified Types of Standardized Tests and Other Measures For a Selected Sample of Representative Projects By School Level.[1]

	Projects in: Skill Development Subjects					Projects in: Attitudinal & Behavioral Developme				
	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Measures 1. Standardized Tests & Inventories										
a. Achievement		67	64	55	26					
b. Intelligence	4	18	14	15	8					
c. Aptitude	4	1	1	2	4					
d. Interest		2	2	1	3		1	2	2	1
e. Attitude							2	2	2	
f. Personality							1	1	1	
2. Other Tests										
a. Locally Devised Tests	1	2	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
b. Teacher Made Tests		1	1	2	1					
c. Student Self-rating Inventory		2	2	2	1		1	1	1	1
3. Other Measures										
a. Teacher Ratings	1	15	15	13	7	2	16	16	12	8
b. Anecdotal Records	1	5	6	5	4					
c. Observer Reports						1	4	4	2	2
d. Parent Questionnaire		4	4	4	2		5	6	3	

1. The sample for Table I is the same sample described in Part II.

Table 2 Summary of Effectiveness of Types of Projects

No criteria were established in Indiana on which the judgements required in this table could be based.

Table 3 Average Daily Attendance and Average Daily Membership Rates for Title I Project Schools Compared with State Norm.

Average daily attendance rates are not kept in Indiana by grade levels.

Table 4 & 5 Dropout Rates For Title I Project Schools Compared with Non-Title I Schools.

Dropout rates have not been kept in the past in Indiana. LEA's are now being urged to keep such records for furture evaluations.

Table 6 Percentage of Students In Title I Project High Schools Continuing Education Beyond High School Compared with State Norm.

Percentage rates of Indiana students continuing education beyond high school have not been required in the past. Some schools have voluntarily reported these percentages for college enrollment on State Department of Public Instruction, Form 35B. The results, however, have never been tabulated.

Table 7 Results for Most Widely Used Tests for Title I Beneficiaries.

No uniform test program exists for the State of Indiana. Results of tests reported by LEA's in Title I Evaluations did not include sufficient detail to allow compilation.

Tabular Data 8 Most Common Approaches Used to Meet Objectives.

a. (see item #5 Part II)

b. The following table includes the number of LEA's using the specified methods of instruction and related services to support instruction - no break down by specific project objective was made in Indiana.

METHOD OF INSTRUCTION	NO. OF LEA's[1.]
Teacher Aides	38
Audio Visual Materials	54
Regular Classroom Instruction	67
Programmed Instruction	16
Tutoring	9
Field Trips	19
RELATED SERVICE	
Inservice Training	36
Guidance & Counseling	38
Library Services	49
Health Services	44
Clothing	11
Attendance Services	21
Speech and Hearing	13
Transportation Services	23

1. These results are taken from the sample described in Part II.

APPENDIX

STATE OF INDIANA MAY 1966

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF INDIANA
William E. Wilson, Superintendent
227 State House

Old Trails Building
309 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana

TO: All local schools operating P. L. 89-10 Title I Projects

FROM: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P. L. 89-10)

RE: LEA Annual Evaluation Report

General Instructions

Enclosed are guidelines established by the State Department of Public Instruction for the evaluation of projects and activities initiated with Title I funds.

Please complete all the questions if possible, and feel free to add any pertinent information to the report that reflects program effectiveness. The completed report will enable this office to prepare and disseminate a state report of Title I activities during the past year which should be of aid to future planning or projects.

It is realized that some schools will not be able to complete all phases of the report, but please use the areas identified in establishing your evaluation plan for next year's project. This report in no way affects the manner in which you proposed to evaluate the Title I project. It simply represents the form we request you follow in submitting the report to the State Department.

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FINAL REPORT NO LATER THAN THIRTY (30) DAYS AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM.

FOR STATE OFFICE USE ONLY
LEA NO. _____
COUNTY CODE _____
SMSA CLASS _____
DATE RECEIVED _____

ESEA OF 1965
Title I
Annual Evaluation Report

PART I.: IDENTIFYING INFORMATION
(Please fill in the following information)

NAME OF SCHOOL
CORPORATION _____ COUNTY _____

ADDRESS _____

PERSON(S) COMPLETING
EVALUATION REPORT _____

PROJECT NUMBER(S) REPORT COVERS _____

PART II--ACTIVITIES

1. Check the major activity implemented by the Title I project.
(Check only one)

__ Art
__ English Language Arts
__ Reading
__ Foreign Languages
__ Health & Safety Education
__ Mathematics
__ Music
__ Natural Sciences
__ Physical Education & Recreation
__ Social Sciences/Social Studies
__ Business Education/Office Occupations
__ Distributive Education
__ Home Economics
__ Industrial Arts
__ Technical Education
__ Trade & Industrial Education
__ Pre-Kindergarten Education
__ Kindergarten Education
__ Elementary Education
__ Secondary Education
__ Education of Handicapped
__ Other (please specify by indicating combination of above activities or other activities not included in the above list)

2. Methods of instruction employed by the school
(Check one or more as they apply to your project(s)

__ Audio-Visual
__ Classroom Instruction
__ Cooperative Work Experience
__ Educational Television
__ Field Trips
__ Laboratory & Shopwork
__ Mobile Classrooms
__ Programmed Instruction
__ Teacher Aides
__ Tutoring
__ Work - Study
__ Other (please specify)

3. Please indicate the number of personnel actually employed in Title I in each of the following areas.

More than ½ time	½ time or less		More than ½ time	½ time or less	
____	____	Administration	____	____	Speech Pathologist & Audiologist
____	____	Guidance & Counseling			
____	____	Remedial Reading	____	____	Teacher of Emotionally Disturbed
____	____	Attendance			
____	____	Nursing	____	____	Teacher of Crippled and/or Health Impaired
____	____	Teacher Aide			
____	____	Teacher of Mentally Retarded	____	____	Psychological Services
			____	____	School-Social worker
			____	____	Pre-Kindergarten
			____	____	Kindergarten
			____	____	Other (please specify)

4. Check one or more indicating the related services supporting instruction.

__ Transportation
__ Food Services - Breakfast
__ Food Services - Lunch
__ Clothing
__ Dental
__ Health Appraisal
__ Psychiatric
__ Other Health Services
__ Attendance Services
__ Guidance & Counseling
__ Other (Please specify)
__ Library Services
__ Psychological Services
__ School-Social Work
__ Speech Pathology & Audiology
__ In-Service Training

PROJECT III: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND DESCRIPTION

_____1. Give the unduplicated count of public school educationally disadvantaged children involved in your approved program(s). (Number of children participating in all projects less estimated number deducted for double counting.)

_____2. Did your community have a Community Action Program approved under the Office of Economic Opportunity at the time of project approval?

_____3. Indicate the number of public school children you anticipated serving as stated in Part II, Section A, #7 of your Title I application.

_____4. Indicate the number of nonpublic school children you anticipated serving as stated in Part II, Section A, #7 of your Title I application.

_____5. Circle the letter below which indicates how each of your projects employed the following evaluation designs.

a. Two group experimental designs using the project group and a conveniently available nonproject group as the control.
b. One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
c. One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, state or national norms.
5d. One group design using data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
e. One group design using data on the project group, but no comparison data.
f. Others (specify by numbers)

Or any combination of above.

IF YOU HAVE NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS IN YOUR SCHOOL CORPORATION, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN PART III.

_____6. Give the unduplicated count of private school children participating in your Title I projects (eliminate double counting).

_____7. How many projects provided services or programs under Title I for private school children in your community?

_____8. How many approved projects provided services or activities for private school children on public school grounds?

a. How many private school children participated under this arrangement?

___during regular school day
___before regular school day
___after regular school day
___both before and after regular school day
___weekends
___summers
___others (specify)

(Project III, page 2)

_____9. How many projects provided services or activities for private school children on private school grounds?

a. How many private school children participated under this arrangement?
___during regular school day
___before regular school day
___after regular school day
___both before and after regular school day
___week ends
___summers
___other (specify)

_____10. How many projects provided services or activities for private school children on other than public or private school premises?

a. How many private school children participated under this arrangement?
___during regular school day
___before regular school day
___after regular school day
___both before and after regular school day
___weekends
___summers
___other (specify)

PART IV: LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS

(Answer each of the following questions in narrative form as it applies to your school corporation and attach to this section.)

1. Briefly indicate how the state educational agency can better aid the local schools in developing Title I projects.

2. What problems and successes has your school experienced in developing and implementing public/private school cooperative projects?

3. Indicate how the school is disseminating data

   a. to other local agencies

   b. to the state educational agency

4. Explain how the school corporation determined its evaluation procedure for Title I projects.

   a. List the names and titles of all state personnel involved in evaluation assistance.

   b. List the names, titles, and institutions or agencies of all consultants involved in providing evaluation assistance.

   c. List the names and titles of local personnel involved in determining the evaluation program.

5. Under each of the following categories, describe the major problems encountered by the school in administering the Title I program.

   a. Developing proposals

   b. Operation and service

   c. Evaluation

   d. Other

6. What suggestions do you have for revising Title I?

   a. Legislation

   b. Rules and regulations

7. Do you anticipate or have you developed plans for using Title I funds in conjunction with Title III projects?

   _____ If so, describe briefly.

PART IV (page 2)

8. Describe successes and difficulties encountered in the community in securing Community Action Agency, O.E.O. and LEA cooperation.

9. Describe the interrelationships of the two programs and particularly the extent to which the two acts are used in a reinforcing manner.

PART V. Project Descriptions

1. List in rank order the methods used to establish project areas of target schools (for example, census information, AFDC payments, other welfare data, health statistics, housing statistics, school surveys, etc.).

2. List in rank order and describe the most pressing needs in the community that your Title I project is designed to meet (for example, reading deficiencies, pre-school programs, health and food services, guidance, etc.).

3. Indicate the average per pupil cost of all approved projects. (Divide the total unduplicated number of children who participated in Title I programs by the total cost of these programs.)

4. Indicate the principal problems encountered in implementing projects. (Be specific, e.g., if lack of personnel is a problem, indicate what types of personnel.)

5. List and briefly describe particularly innovative and/or exemplary projects or activities that include new approaches to education. (Include human interest materials, etc.)

6. List in rank order the methods used to develop or increase staff for Title I projects.

7. For each appropriate school level, list the evaluative instrument(s) used in the schools.

School Level	Evaluative Instrument	Form
Pre-kindergarten/kindergarten		
Grades (1-3)		
Grades (4-6)		
Grades (7-9)		
Grades (10-12)		

PART V (continued)

8. For each of the school levels listed before, cite the activities judged to have been most effective.

   Early years----------Preschool through grade 3
   Middle years----------Grade 4 through grade 6
   Teen years----------Grade 7 through grade 12

9. For each of the school levels you listed above, discuss the strengths and weaknesses of critical procedural aspects (e.g. facilities, materials, equipment, personnel qualifications and training, schedule, organization, evaluation, etc.). Do this on separate sheets and attach to your report.

PART VI - Tabular Data

The following table is a suggested manner you may wish to use in reporting data obtained from your Title I project. This table is by no means all inclusive and is an example of only one objective whereas you may have had several objectives in the project. In reporting the results of your project, please include, if possible, charts, test results, and data under the heading Part VI on separate sheets of paper. Possible charts you may wish to include in the report could cover such areas as increased individual and group attention, increased utilization of textbooks and/or equipment, and increase in rate of attendance for Title I project children.

EVALUATION REPORT

NAME OF SCHOOL:_____ PROJECT NUMBER_____

ADDRESS:_____

DATE:_____

Date(s) of testing and/or other methods of evaluation. PRE-TEST_____POST TEST_____

OBJECTIVES (goals)	METHODS-CONTENT-OUTLINE (to meet goals)	EVALUATION Instrument Procedures Techniques (list)	EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT
Example 1. To enable the educationally disadvantaged child to read at a level which more nearly parallels his ability*	1. Individualized Instruction a. Development of pictorial composition b. Exercises in visual discrimination c. Work with materials on auditory impression d. Play listening games e. Play work games f. Use experimental charts 2. Group instruction a. Singing & other forms of verbal expression b. Listening games c. Field trips d. Talking about experiences 3. Utilization of specialists a. Remedial reading teacher b. Psychologist c. Medical services d. Social services	1. Standardized test scores a. Pre-Post Reading readiness tests b. Comparison of achievement scores. (Pupils with national norms) 2. Other sources of evaluative data a. Checklists of continued progress. (Teacher) b. Rating attitudes toward learning c. Teacher & staff observation for social development 3. Pre-tests will take place the first week of the project Post-tests and rating sheets throughout the project	1. Standardized test scores a. Name of test (1) Pre-test scores (2) Post-test scores b. California Reading Test (1) Pupils scores (2) National norms 2. Other sources of Evaluative data a. Rating on continuous progress - excellent b. Rating on attitude toward learning - improved c. Rating on social development - normal

* A different sheet should be used for each objective using this format.